# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/021,016 | 12/19/2001 | Alexandre Drobychev | 80168-0239 | 8774 |

32658        7590        11/02/2005

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| VO, TED T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2191 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/021,016 | DROBYCHEV ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ted T. Vo | 2191 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/20/05 and RCE on 09/01/05*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16, 18-26 and 29-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16, 18-26 and 29-32* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 December 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 07/20/05, entered by REC on 9/01/05.

- The Interview summary on 10/03/05 has been placed on the application's record. The objection of Oath/Declaration on of 37 CFR 1.56(a) is withdrawn.

- Claims 1, 10, 21 are amended; claims 17, 27-28 have been canceled.

- Claims 1-16, 18-26, and 29-32 are pending in this application.

### *Response to Amendments*

2. Applicants' amendment filed on 07/20/2005 has been fully considered. It should be note that the Claims provided in this application use abstract terms.

For example, limitation, *an interface providing access to data elements, including a data and object repository*, is generic that a computer Windows' editor could read this limitation.

For example, limitation, *functional support for application logic based upon inheritance from the commerce applications platform*, is broad that JavaBeans, COM objects could read this limitation.

For example, limitation, *functional support for presentation logic,* is so abstract that HTML, XML, UML, C++, etc could read this limitation.

For example, limitation, *functional support for maintaining permanent and session application data persistent across user request boundaries within a single user session*, is conceptual that any manipulation in a use session could read this limitation.

For example, limitation, *an interface for access to a business object during the user session*, is so abstract that any editor of a computer's Windows could read this limitation.

With regards to the argument in the Remarks section, p.9, where Applicants mentioned about "Kapczynsky, p.19" and "a single user's session may occur across both servers", Examiner would like address that Applicants' specification does not concise in order to make the claimed limitation distinct

from such an Examiner's interpretation. The limitation "within" is not narrowed from the word "may" or the

phrase "in this case" as in the reference. Moreover, the Argument fails to address the novelty of the

claimed limitation as required in 1.111(c) (See MPEP 714.04).

All other Arguments are moot because of new ground of rejection.


*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*


3.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for

the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –


(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or
in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for
patent in the United States.


4.      Claims 1-16, 18-26, and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Netscape Application Builder, "User Guide", 1999 (hereinafter: NAB).


Given the broadest interpretation of Claims in light of the specification:

As per claim 1: NAB discloses,

*A commerce applications platform for providing features and services for commerce software*

*applications, and operatively adaptable to a server platform capable of server-side presentation logic, the*

*commerce applications platform comprising:*

*an interface providing access to data elements* (EJBs), *including a data and object repository*

(See c2-1, the table in Parts of an Application: Data access layer; see c6.1, sec Creating Data Access

Logic);

*functional support for application logic based upon inheritance from the commerce applications*

*platform;* (See c2-1, the table in sec. Parts of an Application: Data access layer);

*functional support for presentation logic* (See the table in sec. Parts of an Application:

Presentation layer; see c7-1, sec. Creating Presentation Logic);

*functional support for maintaining permanent and session application data persistent across user*

*request boundaries within a single user session* (See c7-11, Working with Session Management; see c9-

1, About Enterprise JavaBeans, Entity Beans); *and*

*an interface for access to a business object during the user session* (See the table in sec. Parts of

an Application: Business layer; see c9-1, sec. Creating Business Logic, refer EJBs/Servets).

As per claim 2: NAB discloses,

*The commerce applications platform of claim 1, wherein the data elements are stored within a computer-*

*readable medium in the form of a data structure forming a list of at least one data element, wherein each*

*data element comprises: a first field containing data representing a data element name; a second field*

*containing data representing the data element type; and a third field containing data representing the data*

*element value* (E.g. see c7-2, Servlet Configuration (NTV) Files).

As per claim 3: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 1, further comprising a rule*

*engine for evaluating rule parameters* (E.g. see c8-12-13).

As per claim 4: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 1, further comprising a data*

*management interface for the storage and retrieval of data during a user session* (See C7-11, Working

with Session Management).

As per claim 5: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 1, further comprising user*

*authentication logic that provides or denies a user access to the commerce software applications* (See

c7-15, Validation; see c8-12, the table; see c8-13, the expressions – For example, the user/password will

deny a user who enters incorrect ID).

As per claim 6: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 1, further comprising a data*

*store interface used to transfer data to and from a data store* (e.g. see c7-14-15, Accessing Data Source

via JDBC; and the connection to LDAP server in c10-9, 10).

As per claim 7: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 6, wherein the data store*

*further comprises LDAP data stores* (See the connection to LDAP server in c10-9, 10).

As per claim 8: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 6, wherein the data store further comprises database data stores* (e.g. see c7-14-15, Accessing Data Source via JDBC; and the connection to LDAP server in c10-9, 10).

As per claim 9: NAB discloses, *The commerce applications platform of claim 1, wherein the business object is cached during the user session* (See c9-3, refer to Entity EJBs).

As per claim 10: NAB discloses,

A method for implementing a first software application resident on a commerce application platform (Refer EJBs discussed in the entire reference), *comprising:*

providing presentation information by the first software application seeking input data from a user (See c7-15, Validation, see list in Type Validation: *presentation information, seeking input data);*

receiving input data from the user for use by the first software application (See c7-15, Validation; see c8-12);

passing the input data to the commerce application platform for validation (See c7-15, Validation; see c8-12, the table);

validating the data by the commerce application platform (See c8-13, the expressions);

providing, by the commerce application platform, business object functionality to the application (See EJBs in entire reference);

preparing presentation information by the application based upon the business object functionality (See c7 and c8); and

accessing permanent and session application data persistent across user request boundaries within a single user session (See c7-11, Working with Session Management; see c9-1, About Enterprise JavaBeans, Entity Beans).

As per claim 11: NAB discloses,

The method of claim 10, wherein the step of providing presentation information further comprises providing static and dynamic presentation data (See the reference: validation: see parameters used in validation).

As per claim 12: NAB discloses,

*The method claim 10, wherein the passing of input data further comprises passing user identification information* (See Validation: such as password; see c6-27: Setting Data Connection).

As per claim 13: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 10, wherein the passing of input data further comprises passing data corresponding to commerce functionality* (See Validation: such as password; see c6-27: Setting Data Connection; and refer to methods used in servets and EJBs).

As per claim 14: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 10, wherein the step of validating the data further comprises invoking a rule engine to determine a validation result* (See c8-13, the expressions).

As per claim 15: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 10, further comprising the step of creating, by the commerce application platform, a business object for providing business functionality* (See c.9: Creating Business Logic).

As per claim 16: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 10, further comprising the step of accessing, by the commerce application platform, an existing business object* (See c.9: Creating Business Logic; see the file system such as shown in c9-6).

As per claim 18: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 10, further comprising the step of implementing a second software application on the commerce application platform* (See c.9: Creating Business Logic. For example, see discussion Adding Objects by Dragging and Dropping in c8-8; moreover, "Creating" in Creating Business Logic has means implementing a second software application).

As per claim 19: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 18, further comprising the step of implementing a second software application by concurrently implementing the first software application and the second software application* (See c.9: Creating Business Logic: "Creating" has means implementing a second software application: Simply, a user may use all Windows' commands, Dragging and Dropping, for doing this task).

As per claim 20: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 18, further comprising the step of accessing a business object by both the first and the second software applications* (See c.9: Creating Business Logic; and see editors used in the entire reference, example, the file system shown in c9-6 allowing a user to access any EBJ in the computer).

As per claim 21: NAB discloses, *A method for providing services to a first software application residing on a commerce application platform, comprising: receiving from the application input data for validation; validating the input data; providing business object functionality to the application; and accessing permanent and session application data persistent within a single user session* (See rationale in Claim 10 above).

As per claim 22: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, wherein the input data received from the application relates to a commerce application function* (Refer parameters shown in Validation).

As per claim 23: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, wherein the input data received from the application includes user identification information* (Refer parameters shown the table in Validation).

As per claim 24: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, wherein the step of validating the input data further comprises invoking a rule engine to determine a validation result* (See c8-13, the expressions);

As per claim 25: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, further comprising the step of creating a new business object* (See c.8).

As per claim 26: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, further comprising the step of accessing an existing business object* (See Examiner's rationale in Claim 16).

As per claim 29: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, further comprising the step of creating a persistent object based on a persistent object framework* (See Entity EJBs).

As per claim 30: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, further comprising the step of receiving input data from a second application on the commerce application platform* (See c7-15, Validation; see c8-12, including Examiner' rationale in Claim 18).

As per claim 31: NAB discloses, *The method of claim 21, wherein the step of receiving input data from the first software application further comprises concurrently receiving input data from a second software application* (See Examiner' rationale in Claim 19).

As per claim 32: NAB discloses, The method of claim 21, wherein the step of providing business object functionality to the application further comprises providing the same business object functionality to a second software application (See Examiner' rationale in Claim 20).

### *Conclusion*

5.      The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Thomas**, "Selecting Enterprise JavaBeans Technology", Patricia Seybold Group, pages 1-27,

1998

**HP**, "Total-e-server 7.3", Hewlett Packard White paper, pages 1-29, 6-2001.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be

reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei

Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708.

The facsimile number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is the

Central Facsimile number **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to

the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may

be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for

unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ted T. Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2191
October 28, 2005